(MR. SPEAKER)

continue. I fill the vacancy by including the name of Sri S. D. Kothavale in the panel, who will be among the four members that will be presiding over the deliberations in my absence.

Hon'ble Members could have seen that I have not been able to pick up my voice. I have consumed lot of medicine to equip myself to this extent. Medical advice has been that my throat requires complete rest for two days. The Statement is placed in the hands of hon'ble Members.

Now, naturally, hon'ble members might or at any rate some might—and I will not be wrong in thinking—require some time. I deem it proper to allow some time at their disposal. I therefore propose to adjourn the House for two hours. On reassembling, if my throat responds, I will come and preside; otherwise, members will kindly excuse me.

The House will now adjourn for two hours.

The House adjourned for Recess at Twenty Minutes past One of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Members' Representations.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I trust members have carefully pondered over what I stated. When I finished reading my statement. I thought the Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa wanted to say something.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).–Sir, I wanted to know from you whether that statement is open for discussion because it is stated in the statement: "If for any reason the work of the House is not transacted even today, the responsibility will lie on those that are obstructing. How this situation is to be tackled is the only point for consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—A solution is to be found and there need not be any Debate. I am prepared to adjourn the House for another hour if any useful purpose will be served thereby. I may inform the House that for every word that I utter, I am exerting on my vocal chord and there is a certain amount of pain. In the light of what I have said, if members think that any solution can be found, they can do it. So far as I am concerned, I have endeavoured my best and failed and I do not propose to do it again unless all desire it. Somebody came and told me that I could try to find a solution not as Speaker but as Vaikunta Baliga. I said, "as Vaikunta Baliga I am dead and gone; do not call that person again; It is only as Speaker and as none else."

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೈಕುಂಠ ಬಾಳಿಗಾರವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ಗೌರವವಿದೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರುವು ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಗೌರವವಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶಂಕೆ ಪಡಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ..... ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರು ಎತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಿಮಗೆ ನೆನಪಿರಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಬೇರೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH (Nanjangud).—Sir, the statement circulated to us deserves serious consideration and I suggest that the House be adjourned by an hour more so that the situation can be tackled.

ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಆರಂಭವಾದಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಾಗ ಇದರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳೇನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೂ ಇದರ ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯ ವನ್ನೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಗಮನಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೂ, ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ತಾವು ತಿಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನೆನ್ನೆ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಅಡ್‌ಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಲು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯ ವಕೀಲರಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಂದರು. ಆಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಹಾಗೂ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ದೊಡ್ಡದು ಮಾಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸಭೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟಾರೆ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದೇನೇ ಇರಲಿ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—To be correct, the Chief Minister did come. I believe there was some misunderstanding. My information is that Sriyuths Sivappa, Siddaveerappa, Channiah and a large number of members were waiting in this hall thinking that they would be called for. At 12-30 P.M. some friends including Sri Channabasappa and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs met me and I requested the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to convey my regards to the Chief Minister and ask him to come. How can I discuss all these matters on the Floor of the House ? Naturally they might feel that it is an embarrassment for them. I do not want to create embarrassment. Everybody has freedom of thought and action. Let there be full freedom of expression. Later on at two minutes to One or one minute past One Sri Sivappa and Sri Siddaveerappa came and told me that they were waiting. I was very happy to learn it. Th ir anxiety was so great that they did not even care to take their lunch. I am grateful to them. That by itself did not solve the problem. I did not want to embarrass anybody. That is how it came about.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಲವನ್ನು ಅಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರೂರವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಹತಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಏನು ಬಂದಿವೆ, ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವು ದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ತಾತ್ಕಾ ಲಿಕವಾದ, ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದ ಕಾರ್ಯಸೂಚಿಯನ್ನು ಏಕಾ ಏಕಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದೂ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡಿ, ಈಗ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ, ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ; ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದೆವು. ಆದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಮತ್ತು ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಮಗೇ ಅನ್ನಿಸಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ

†Indicates that remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ)

ಈ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ನಂತರ ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕ್ರೂರವಾಗಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಮಗೆ ನೀವು ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ 10 ಸಾರಿ ಜನ್ಮವೆತ್ತಿ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. 10 ಸಾರಿ ಜನ್ಮವೆತ್ತಿ ನಾನು ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆತಂಕವನ್ನು ಉಂಟುಮಾಡಿದವರು ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರೂ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಈ ಕಡೆಯವರೂ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಅಂತೂ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಖಂಡಿತ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಸಹ ಅಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಎತ್ತಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನದೇನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪಾಪಸ್ಸು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧನಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, believe me when I say that we have the greatest respect for you. Let us not be understood in any other different way. We are also sorry that in spite of your indifferent health, we are troubling you in this way ; or it may look that we are troubling you in this way. Thank you very much.

Now let me come to the point. From the beginning we have made it very clear that as responsible men—responsible not only to this House but to the country, we are very much interested in seeing that there is smooth working of this Legislature. We made it also very clear that when we come here, we come here with the definite purpose of serving the country. It touched our chord when the programme was revised. If it was said that you alone were responsible for the revision, we could not have obstructed ; we could not have raised any objection. But the point was made clear here that this programme was changed at the instance of the Treasury Benches. Though, of coures, the seal is given by you, it is at their instance it was done. That touched us, for the simple reason that this is a Budget Session. We all know how very important and vital is the Budget Session. This is not an interim budget they have presented. The hon. Finance Minister is here and if I am wrong, he may correct me. For instance in other States like Madras, Kerala and West Bengal, the Governments have presented only interim budgets. Here a full budget is presented. When we comment on that, other complications will arise. So, I am not entering into the details.

When that is the position, we were equally anxious to do useful work. But by sitting here only for five days, we thought no useful purpose will be served. Therefore, on the very first day, I begged of you

and I requested you to adjourn the House "today only" and said, let us not spend public money. I am one of those who believe that not a single naye paise should be spent without any necessary reason. That is why I made that request on the very first day and said: without loss of public money, let us disperse "today only".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Where are we leading to? The hon. member is repeating what has already been said in so many other words.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Therefore, what I say is that on that very day, we made it very clear. We stretch our hand of friendship. It is now for the Leader to take the Leader of the Opposition into confidence and see how best to iron out the difficulty that has arisen. It is even said that you were pleased to say that it is for the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition to sit together and iron out the differences, if any. You made that pertinent observation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not my idea. That is the essence of parliamentary democracy. Democracy was born much earlier than me.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What I am saying is, you are our mentor. Such is the position. When we met yesterday, we were expecting all the time that there may be some responsive call coming from the other side. When we came and sat there for discussion, our hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs came. He said that he had to go on duty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No private conversation will be divulged.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I stop it there. Now the point is, how to go about the other business. The impasse is there unless and until the Government or its spokesman, preferably the Leader of the House explains as to why it has happened, and also he agrees that it was not advisable to have called this short Session, curtailing the six weeks' time that was given to us, by way of expression of regret or in any other appropriate manner. It is only n this way, I think, they may be able to solve this problem because democracy is not only a virtue but it is one of its policies. Now, who could afford to be generous? It is the man in power who can take us into confidence and tell us: "this is the position; let us iron-out the difference."

Mr. SPEAKER.—You did not answer the point as to whether the Question Hour could have been prevented?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The effect of it was, we made it clear when we said that we cannot submit ourselves to the revised programme.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will deal with the Question Hour. The other day, I called upon Prof. Srikantaiah, but he was hesitant. When questions were about to be called yesterday, after the whole of previous day's discussion, the Hon'ble Members stood with one firm determination. I argued and said that any representation that is to be made should come after the Question Hour *i.e.* before the business begins. Nobody yielded. Am I wrong there?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The stand we took and we stand by that even now, because we see that there are no convincing reasons to change the programme. The stand was that unless and until the revised programme which was handed down to us is changed or suitably altered we will not submit ourselves to the revised programme of 5 days starting from 1.00 P.M. to 6.00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Again the member is not meeting the point. The point is, after Question Hour if the Hon'ble Member had done, it would not have cost the efficacy of the saying. That is where I feel that the member is at fault.

†Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—Sir, the position on 2nd May was, Sri Sivappa, under Rule 32, asked the permission of the Hon'ble Speaker to suspend the Question Hour and take up the other issue, *viz.*, the reason for the revised programme. The discussion on that aspect went up to 6-30 p.m. on 2nd May, and you said that the matter would be taken up on 3rd May. Therefore..... ..

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Secretary may please get the proceedings. Many members have been saying like that. I want to verify. Everybody thinks that there has been a debate going on and it will be continued. With regard to asking for leave, I deliberately said : I may or I may not grant. But, still when members wanted to say, it did not change the nature. Leave has not been given. I want the Member to point out from the recorded proceedings as to which is the portion in which it is stated that this Debate will be resumed tomorrow ?

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—The issue was whether Rule 32 should be suspended and the other matter should be taken into consideration ? Discussion on that aspect went up to 6-30 p.m. on 2nd May. In fact at the fag end of 2nd May, the Leader of the House made a statement. Still, the matter did not end there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which matter did not end ? It did not end because the members went on violating the Rules.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—We pressed for the reason for the revised programme.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was contrary to Rules. Does the Rule give the member the right to say that the same thing should be continued next day ?

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—It is not as if you were not within the Rules. We requested you to suspend Rule 32. At any rate, I should say that the discussion went on with the permission of the Speaker. It cannot be that there was an obstruction. Further, that aspect continued. The Leader of the House gave a statement explaining the reason, but we were not satisfied. Again the discussion went on till 6-30 p.m. and the House was adjourned to meet on 3rd May. We met on

3rd May, but we did not meet in a proper way in the sense that in the beginning itself the House was adjourned for two hours. and again we met and we adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—'We' means who ?

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.— The House adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The whole House does not talk. I have got the list of persons who spoke. It is limited to those who prevented the work.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I am soory ; the House was adjourned by the Speaker. We again met at 3 O'Clock and again the House was adjourned. Today we met, but again the House adjourned. So, it is not as if the matter that was seized on 2nd May has been finalised. It cannot be said that we are obstructing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am glad that the Member has made the position clear, and I suppose it is on behalf of himself and all others that they had no intention of preventing the Question Hour. What he means to say is, no decision having been arrived at, on a matter talked about on the 2nd May, it follows that it is over-flowing till a decision is arrived at. I do not know whether he means very seriously to stick to that position. After all, discussion was there. I began giving the Ruling. I doubted whether the Ruling was necessary. I said, the whole matter is over. If, after that one or the other Member goes on talking and imagine that this debate is going to continue, in reality it does not exist.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—In fact, you said that the Debate will continue for the next day—whether it may be in a manner of Ruling or opinion. After that was over, Dr. Nagan Gowda went on giving sermons. I was wondering whether he was explaining the Ruling of Speaker. It was at that moment that the matter was again raised and after him somebody also spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have understood the member, he may kindly sit down. Now I put a simple question. Even today the Question Hour has lapsed by passage of time. I want to know whether there is any objection either on this Side or the other side for the Question Hour being taken up tomorrow at One 'O' Clock ?

Sri H. B. JWALANIAH (Hassan).—Sir, I have got objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under what Rule he is objecting ? Is it because he has got a right to speak here ? He may quote the Rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಜ್ವಾಲನಯ್ಯ.—ನಾವು ಅಬ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಅಬ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಜ್ವಾಲನಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರಾದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ವಾದವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಪ್ಪು ನಿಮ್ಮಮೇಲೆ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಜ್ವಾಲನಯ್ಯ.—ಅಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ.

4.00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I ask Sri Jwalaniah whether we can take up Question Hour tomorrow. I heard him saying that he is going to object. Now I ask him to tell the rule under which he is going to raise objection.

Sri K. H. PATIL (Gadag).—It is not we that are obstructing. It is the Treasury Bench that is obstructing. We should not be deprived of asking the question. But we are asking the propriety of calling the question. We are asking the Leader of the House to justify the reason. He is hiding the facts and he is misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Questions are going to be put. Will the member obstruct ?

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Regarding the validity of holding this very Session, if you take a decision and then come to a decision, then we will go ahead with other matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no reconciliation between what the member said. Tomorrow I will call the Questions. At that time will the member say "no question can be put ?"

Sri K. H. PATIL.—May I appeal to the father of the House, Mr. Speaker, that it is our right to ask Questions ? But why we are brushing aside our right, is a point to be considered by you.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the right to ask Question whenever I call upon to put. If the member thinks it is his right to ask, he is entirely mistaken. I have to call upon the member first to ask question. Till then the member's right is zero.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ಯಾಮೊ, ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವನ ತಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಮೂಲಭೂತ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸು ವಂತಹ ಮಹತ್ತರವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಈ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿವಾದಗ್ರಸ್ತ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿವೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಘನತೆ, ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ತರವಾದ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗೌರವಗಳು ಇವೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಗೌರವ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಳ್ಳಷ್ಟೂ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತಹ ಗೌರವ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತ ಕಡೆ ಇರುವ 89 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಥಮವಾಗಿ ಅರಿಕೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾಣದಂತಹ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಅವಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ನಾವು ಬಂದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಲವಲೇಶವೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿರಿಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ವಿರೋಧಾಭಾಸವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ನಾವು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವಷ್ಟೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತಹ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 40 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು 5 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಕುಂಠಿತ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಉದ್ಭವವಾದ ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇರುವ ಜನ ನಾವು. It is the very essence of democracy.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As per the circular issued from your own hands, you summoned us to come here for 40 days.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Will the Hon'ble Member kindly tell me under what rule I am to say that this debate is to go on and the business should be taken up after that ? Are there any rules ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Are we not entitled to request you ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—On proper occasion and at proper time. I have admitted two motions. But the members are not allowing those motions to come up. There must be some reasonable attitude.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮಗಿಂತಲೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇರುವ ಈ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಹುಮ್ಮಸ್ಸು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ನನಗೆ ಇದೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಸಿದ್ದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರೆ ಅವರು ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಶಕ್ತಿ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನವನ್ನು ಸಾಧನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಇನ್ನೂ ಶೈಶವಾವಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದು ಬಾಳಿ ಬೆಳಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಿಗೆ, ಶಕ್ತಿಪ್ರದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಬಗ್ಗುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಆತ್ಮಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವ ಮತ್ತು ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಲೀ, ಅಥವಾ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು 40 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ 5 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಕುಂಠಿತ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಮೂಲಭೂತ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಎದೆಗಾರಿಕೆಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದವರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ).—ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳದೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ (ನ್ಯಾಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಆ ಕಡೆ 10 ಜನರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಡೆ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನಾದರೂ ಆಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಆ ಕಡೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲ. ನಾನು ಸಂತೋಷಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಸಭೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸಂತೋಷಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅನ್ಯಾಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I do not unerstand what is going on here, because there is no motion before the House. Since there is no motion before the House all these things have happened because when one of the members on this side wanted that the closure motion may be put. You readily observed that there was no motion at all. If the Hon'ble Members wanted to say that the Government is wrong or the session has been unnecessarily cut short on account of emergent situation or something like that, let them make a motion. Otherwise this discussion will end nowhere. In your goodness you have allowed a sort of debate thinking that it will end. Sir, it is not going to end.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a debate, It is a representation.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, it is too much of a representation without a motion. Let them make a motion and let it be considered. We shall take such action as the House decides. That is why I am making a representation to you that if they want to discuss anything let them do so by way of a motion.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I rise to a point of order. The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is thinking we are talking some other matter. We are now raising a very fudamental issue. It is part of law that is involved here. You convened a meeting fixing up the agenda for 40 days and it has been disturbed by a modified notice. According to the understanding of the Members on this side, it is done at the instigation of the Treasury Benches. Therefore, Sir, I say that the meeting convened now modifying the original agenda is illegal. I want your valuable ruling on this point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give a ruling. There is absolutely no merit in this point of order. I have a feeling that the Hon'ble Member has raised it just to disturb the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—There are two motions which you have allowed. Let them be taken up. Can this House or the Chair allow the Members to hold up the proceedings like this? If they want to hold up the proceedings, let them make a motion to that effect and if it is passed, they have every right to hold up the proceedings. I suggest that the motion which has been tabled may be taken up.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Does it mean that we are talking in the air all these three days without any meaning?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Let them talk in the air or on the ground. That is not a matter to be considered.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What is your perception?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—These people are not talking on any motion at all.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There is a notion in the medical science and it is only mad man that talks without any reason. At any rate, we do not belong to that category.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—If the Hon'ble Member wants to call us mad men, perhaps he is more mad than we.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA (Bharmasagar).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs just now stated that he does not know what is going on here. That may be verified from the records. The man who does not know what is going on here has been saying that we are talking in the air. He cannot make such a statement here.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I request the Hon'ble Member to understand what I say. What I said was that there is no motion on which the Hon'ble Members are talking. Let there be a motion, and let them talk on it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Duggappa raised what he considered to be a very interesting point of order. He is aware that several members have been saying so many things which have not been understood by others. It only means that they are so abstruse or philosophical that it is only the wisest that can understand. Therefore, if at any time it has to be thought that Mr. Duggappa is not able to understand and another Member says he does not understand, it should not be taken in that literal sense. Even if that is taken in the literal sense, it will only mean that we have to study further till light dawns on us and it will never come under a point of order. How does the member raise a point of order like that? Sri Duggappa is a seasoned Parliamentarian!

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂಠಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ 2-3ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಜರ್ಜ್ ನಡೆದಾಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮೋಷನ್ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ತಮಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಜ್ಞಾಪಕವಿದೆ. 4½ಗಂಟೆ ಆಗುವವರೆಗೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಆಗ ಮೋಷನ್ ಫ್ರಾಪರ್ ಆಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಮೋಷನ್ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಖಂಡರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಮಾರನೆಯ ದಿವಸವೂ ಮೋಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲ technically and legally speaking ಜರ್ಜ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಯಿತು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ತಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ದಿವಸ ಜರ್ಜ್ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿರುವ ಅವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಸೇರಿ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂದಿಗ್ಧ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡವುದು ಸರಿ.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food).—Technically, is the member entitled to talk from any seat?

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—I admit technically, I am not in the seat. My seat is just behind.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then technically why is the member speaking?

(Laughter)

[Sri Vatal Nagaraj rose to speak].

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾದ ಆದಿವೇಶನ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಭಾಷಣಗಳು ಬೆಳೆದು ಹೋದವು. ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರು ಎರಡು ಸಂಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಎರಡು ದಿವಸ ಮೋಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಅವರ ಭಾವನೆ ಕೇವಲ ತಪ್ಪು. ಯಾರ ಬಾಯಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕಟ್ಟಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಬಾಯಿ ಕಟ್ಟಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹೊರಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಡೂಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಮೋಷನ್ ತರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮುಂಡಿಸಿದ ಮೋಷನ್ ಇದೆ, ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಇದೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಿ, ಲೀವ್ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಲೀವ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ನಾನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡವೇ? ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಎರಡು ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿದ್ದು. ಆದರೆ ಅದರ ನಂತರವೂ ಏನೂ ಆದಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಪುನರಪಿ ಬಂದದ್ದು. ನನಗೆ ಏನೊಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ನಾಳೆ ನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸಿಗುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈಗ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೋಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡಿಸಿ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರು ಪೆನೆಲ್ ಆಫ್ ಚೇರ್‌ಮೆನ್ ಲಿಸ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೋ, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಕೂರಿಸಿ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಎಂದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕೊತವಾಲರಿಯವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಸ್ಪೀಮಿ, ಡಿಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಕಳಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದರೆ, ಅದರಂತೆ ಆರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—I am raising a point of order for calling Sri Kothavale to occupy the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—First the member has to satisfy me as to whether there is any point of order in it. When the Chair calls upon a Member to come and occupy the Seat, is there a point of order ? The member has to make a representation.

† Sri S. S. SHETTAR (Hubli).—It is a representation, Sir. I am inviting kind attention of the Chair to article 180 (2) of the Constitution which reads as follows :

> " (2) During the absence of the Speaker from any sitting of the Assembly the Deputy Speaker or, if he is also absent, such person as may be determined by the rules of procedure of the Assembly, or if no such person is present, such other person as may be determined by the Assembly, shall act as Speaker."

This is the reading of article 180 (2). We have to rely upon the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Assembly for further guidance. I invite your kind attention to Rule 9 which says :

> " 9. At the commencement of every session, the Speaker shall nominate from amongst the members of the Assembly

a panel of not more than four Chairmen, any one of whom may preside over the Assembly in the absence of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, when so requested by the Speaker, or in his absence by the Deputy Speaker."

It is important to mark the words '*At the commencement of every session*'. My representation is that before this session began, if the Speaker so desired, he could have nominated four persons. It has already been done. But one of the Members has resigned. In her place, if any member is to be appointed, this is not the stage for such appointment. It could have been done at the beginning of the Session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Where were the members when I made the announcement? Were they sleeping? I made the announcement this morning. Nobody raised any point. I am not going to shut it out. I am going to deal with it. But were the Members not aware when I made the announcement? When a Member has resigned from the panel I have to bring it to the notice of the House. I brought it to the notice of the House and I said that so and so is appointed in the vacancy.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—At that stage possibly we could not have taken any objection for the reason that immediately after the statement was made, you left the House. That is exactly what I wanted to bring to your kind notice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I made that announcement and read my speech this moring and after that I went. You should have said this before I began my speech. After I made the announcement, that item is over. Next Item was taken up and I went. But I am not going to shut you out.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, little did we expect at that time that on account of your indisposition, you will be leaving the seat.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Time for representation is not concerned with my illness. I announced, after that I took about ten minutes to read three pages. That is a totally different point.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I know is there any estoppel for raising that point?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Will the hon. member tell me why I am receiving his representation? It is because I love him. Otherwise, there is no legal right. But I will allow it I am entitled to ask why it was not raised, because if he felt at that time it was wrong and for other reasons he is feeling like that, he wants to raise it now, I want to know why it has not been done earlier.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—I may be permitted to explain as to why it was not raised at that particular juncture. Really speaking it was unnecessary in accordance with the rules of Procedure of the Assembly and if it is not in accordance with the article 180 (2), it is not necessary that it should have been immediately raised. That is the first point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want any further argument on that, if the member thinks that he is entitled to ignore it. That is a pronouncement from the Chair. If he thinks that he is going to sit in judgement and says I will decide like this.....

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—It is not sitting in judgement over the action of the Chair, Sir. My representation is that soon after the announcement, the question of how much time we have taken that will have to be taken into consideration by the Chair. We have not taken a day or two. It is a matter in which we have to take into consideration so many rules and we have to take into consideration article 180 (2).

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member must bring a motion, then. If he wants the matter to be opened, he must bring in a motion, and not a representation. He may please come to the point. I will meet it.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Supposing the Speaker appoints a person who is not competent to act as Chairman of the House, the purpose of tabling the motion will not survive. That is why I have brought that point to your consideration before the person occupies the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What a mistaken opinion! I am bound to receive the notice of motion. I am not bound to receive any representation at this hour. He may please be brief and come to the point.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Whether the objection could have been taken then and there only or whether objection can be taken now is a different matter on which I am not going to address any submission to you now, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even about the jurisdiction saying that I have no right to appoint.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I know you would be the last person to commit any mistake. But it may be by oversight things may happen. After all, no man in this world is infallible and when some such thing happens, it is our duty to bring it to your notice. So far as Mr. Kothavale is concerned, he is a good friend of mine and you have chosen him to occupy the Chair. But so far as the objection is concerned, it is fundamental this way. I know you worship the rules. You want us to worship the rules, because the rules are our guide and what has happened under Rule 9: It is specifically mentioned in that Rule: 'At the commencement of every session' That is why, on the same day the session begins, the Speaker gives a panel of Chairmen and the panel you have announced contains not more than four. Even if you nominate three, it is not irregular. If you nominate two it is not irregular. The upward limit is fixed at four. The Deputy Speaker is there. I do not know why he has not come, and it is not my concern. There are the other two members who are in the panel. It was reported to us today that the Lady Member has resigned. She is at perfect liberty to take any decision...

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it that she has got frightened at the Opposition.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—No, Sir, we respect her and we cannot individually have done anything to hurt her. Now, the only point is, there are others. The Lady Member could have acted in such a manner as to have brought in a reconciliation. Therefore, the point now is, let us not create any bad precedent. Mr. Kothavale cannot occupy the Chair because, he is not properly nominated under rule 9. We would request you to revise your ruling-that this is not the commencement of the session. At the commencement of the session, already nominations have been made to the panel. The other two members are here. My good old friend Dr. Nagan Gowda is here. And my young friend Mr. Ranganath is also here. While saying this, I mean no disrespect to Mr. Kothavale. I am only raising an objection that the nomination is not correct. He may not legally take the Chair. He can only take the Chair when none of these people are present. When somebody is nominated legally under the rules, then, we have no objection.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—I have a little submission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to hear anybody. If I permit one, I will have to permit the others. If I am sure that others will not seek permission, I will permit this member.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—I have one new point. There is no provision in the rules, when a member resigns, for appointment of another person in the panel.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give the ruling.

A point has been raised that my announcement in the morning that one of the members in the panel Smt. Basavarajeswari has resigned, and that Sri S. D. Kothavale is appointed as a member in the panel of Chairmen.

(*Interruption*)

Order, Order. There must be a limit. Everybody who gets an idea immediately jumps up !

I do not think there is much merit in this contention. What was urged was that the appointment of the members of the panel should be done by the Speaker under rule 9. A reference by the Hon'ble Member Shettar, the learned lawyer that he is, to the article is made which article it is, he is perfectly silent about it ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸದರ್ಲ್ಲ ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದ ಕಂದು ಂತ. ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬನವರಾಜೇಶ್ವರಿಯವರು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ ರು ? ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೋಠಾವಳೆಯವರು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನ ತೆಗದುಕೊಂಡರು ? ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬನವರಾಜೇಶ್ವರಿಯವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪೀಡೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಇತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಇದರಿಂದ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರ ತಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬಾ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಓಡುತ್ತವೆ. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ ಅವರು ಹೊಸಬ್ಬಾವ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಲ್ಲುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಸವರಾಜೇಶ್ವರಿಯವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order, ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನು?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತ ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಸಾವಧಾನದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಹಟ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಾಳ್ಮೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಮುಗಿಯುವವರೆಗೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು.

I was mentioning that the article quoted by Mr. Shettar does not provide for the raising of any of the matters now raised before the House. the provision is only with regard to the panel and rule 9 was rightly quoted. That is an enabling rule. It has to be pointed out at the very outset, that this rule is not ineffective now for the appointment in the manner that is indicated. Four persons were mentioned and one of them subsequently desired to be relieved and resigned. Nothing has been pointed out to say under any of the rules that the power of the Speaker is exhausted. It is far from that. It is known that in the past on one occasion or the other, such nominations have been done, and the rules expressly provide that if there is anything that is not specifically provided for, the Speaker has got the residuary powers enabling him to do what is proper. The propriety or otherwise cannot be questioned by criticism of this type. I was rather unhappy when Sri Gopala Gowda raised the point as to whether Smt. Basavarajeswari was dissatisfied and if so dis-affection has been caused by somebody or other. Who that somebody is. it is not for me to investigate nor do I propose to investigate it. Hon'ble Srimathi Basavarajeswari graciously consented to be in the panel. The House has to be grateful to her. I am indeed grateful to her. But can we compel her to remain there? Is she not entitled to resign? That reason for her resignation should be given—the House is not entitled to ask. If theHouse is not entitled to ask, is the Member entitled to make remarks of that type? I do not think it is necessary to go further. Then it was said,—is it because, there is no confidence in the Speaker? I do not know whether Sri Gopala Gowda has got a doubt of that type. If he has, I will leave it at that and not develop the idea. What has been done by me, has been thought over by me. I have not done anything wrong. What I have done is not contrary to the rules. As to whether it is agreeable or whether anybody smells something or not—I cannot possibly help it. Therefore, regarding the objection with regard to the announcement that I made, apart from any question of delay, there is no question of estoppel. Even if there is estoppel, I do not mind. If I had no right, I would not do it. I feel I have got the right and I have done it. Therefore the matter ends there. I would therefore request Sri S. D. Kothavale to come and occupy the chair.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—One point I would wish to bring to your notice and that is—what does the words mean "at the commencement of each session"?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The operation of that rule is over. By virtue of the powers that I possess, I have done it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I humbly submit to you that any residuary powers that are vested in you arise only when the rules are silent with regard to it. But when there is a specific rule ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—When a vacancy occurs among the four, which rule provides ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—No vacancy; it is not incumbent that it should be four.

Mr. SPEAKER,—I have got the option. Do not mistake between incumbency and option.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—You exercised your option on the day when you nominated four members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, the member must say that I have no right. He should not say, under residuary power I do not come; he may say, residuary power does not exist.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Residuary powers are there only when the rules are silent on any point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When a person resigns what is to be done ? Rule is silent and that is why, I have done it.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to allow any discussion on the ruling.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Ruling is there and I know we must respect it rightly or wrongly. My submission is this. We have heard Sri Kothawale for the last three days and he is defending the issue. If he is allowed to sit in the Chair, it will be as well as giving a decision clearly. Therefore, I submit, you should have called upon any of the three other members in the Panel to preside.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give a ruling on this point of order. Now Sri K. H. Patil from Gadag, began with a point of order and ended on making suggestions, allegation and casting aspersions. There is no point of order. If he concedes that I have got the right to appoint and mention and when I have done it, there is further point of order. He wanted to say that Sri Kothawale should not have been appointed for reasons which he mentioned. I do not think it is a point of order.

Further he is under the impression that Sri Kothawale is going to give decision on the matter under issue, before the House. The Speaker never gives a decision. It is the decision of the House and vote of the House that decides. Further, casting reflection on the member even before he has functioned, I think, it is not at all acceptable to me. I have made selections from both the sides. Can any member of the ruling party say: 'if persons from the other side, from the opposition, are put in the Chair, they will give rulings unfavourable to us', just as the member is saying now. That has never been said by any member. I overrule it.

(MR. SPEAKER)

The Secretary reminds me as I have already told Sri Patil and not other members because they were not in my Chamber, that Sri Patil's Motion that the matter arising out of the statement made by the hon. Chief Minister be taken into consideration has been admitted by me. But nothing can come until we begin the business of the House. We are still—what shall I say, I cannot find a proper word—in Tulu that is what is called "KATTHI BEESANE", that is swinging the sword in dark, doing nothing and without killing in that stage.

(Sri V. N. Patil stood up to speak)

Unless it is a point of order.

†Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad)—.I am not raising a point of order but referring to your statement. You were kind enough to give us an assurance that if anything in the message given to the House casts any aspersions, it will be withdrawn. I request your permission to read a portion of it:

> "It comes with no good grace on the part of the persons who assert that available funds needed for many purposes in a State like Mysore are being "wasted" in the manner it is being done by the Treasury Bench in convening this House. For the last two days the State has incurred expenses aggregating to large amounts. When emphasis was laid on the expenses per minute and condemned, causing of similar expenditure without any work being done for two days stands in a bold relief perhaps going against the *bona fides* of the contention. In other words it is to be seen by them whether they are not laying themselves open to the criticism and perhaps possible conclusion by the discerning public that they are committing the same mistake to a greater degree or in a graver measure."

Indirectly, it comes to this ; it is the opposition that has criticised the Government for calling this short session. Having called for such a short session for no purpose, Government is wasting public funds. That was the criticism. The Speaker pointed out to two or three opposition members and said : "are you going to obstruct tomorrow ?" That means, the opposition is obstructing and they are holding up the normal working of the session. "Are you going to obstruct tomorrow" was the question put by the Speaker. It means, casting aspersions on the opposition members.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. member may kindly bring a resolution making out the grievances ; bring a resolution or a motion and say that this is casting aspersion. If he feels that I have failed, he may say so under particular rule. But he cannot say "I want to make a representation" and go on talking like this. He may bring a resolution.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The advice that has been given to us is rather uncalled for. We are not responsible for obstructing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know the name of this hon'ble member. If he is not responsible, let him not put that cap on his head.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The cap is not on my head. This sentence ought not to have been there and that is my earnest request.

[MR. CHAIRMAN (SRI S. D. KOTHAWALE) in the Chair]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—It is unfortunate that the hon'ble Speaker could not preside over the session due to his ill-health. Since he has requested me to occupy the Chair in his absence, I cannot shirk duty. I have got to discharge the functions of Presiding Officer. I approach my duties, in all humility and seek the co-operation of all sections of this House. I may assure that so long as I am here, it shall be my endeavour to maintain strict impartiality and whatever individual opinions I may have, they will not interfere with the discharge of duties so long as I am presiding here. I seek the co-operation of all the hon'ble members and request the House to take up the regular business according to the order of the day.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಈ ನಭೆಯು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ 40 ದಿವಸಗಳವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆಯುಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪವನ್ನು 5 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಕುಂಠಿತಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾದ ನಂತರ ಉಳಿದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any point of order ?

Sri V. N. PATIL.—There is a point of order. On the floor of the House an assurance was given that the Chief Minister will give an explanation as to what necessitated him in cutting down the period of the sittings. Unless that explanation comes and unless it is probed into, no further discussion should take place. We ask the hon'ble Chair that the assurance given to us on the floor of this House may be fulfilled, and unless it is fulfilled no further discussion may be allowed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—That point has been practically decided by the hon'ble Speaker. He has in his statement made just this morning, has made absolutely clear that there was no Debate or discussion and there is no motion before the House. In the circumstances existing now, there is nothing which can be discussed. I therefore think that the regular business should start at once.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—I rise to a point of order. The fact is that for two days discussion has taken place. Now if the Chair were to say that the matter has ended, it is really difficult. I submit no ruling is given from the Chair that the dabate did not take place and that a ruling has been given. I want a ruling from the Chair.